

RECLAMATION

Managing Water in the West

Funding Opportunity Application No. R10AF20001

Central Valley Project Conservation Program and Central Valley Project Improvement Act Habitat Restoration Program

Fiscal Year 2010



U.S. Department of the Interior / U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Bureau of Reclamation Pacific Southwest Region
Mid-Pacific Region
<http://www.usbr.gov/mp/>

September 2009

Table of Contents

Overview.....	Page 3
Proposal Checklist.....	Page 4
General Information (Section I).....	Pages 5-12
I.A. Background and Purpose	
I.B. Program Authority	
I.C. Program Objective	
I.D. Objective of FOA (evaluation criteria)	
I.E. Eligible Projects (Program Priority Actions)	
Award Information (Section II).....	Page 12
II.A. Project Funding Limitations	
II.B. Reclamation and Service Responsibilities	
II.C. Award Date	
Eligibility Information (Section III).....	Pages 12-13
III.A. Eligible Applicants	
III.B. Cost Share Guidelines	
III.C. Evaluation Criteria and Weighting	
III.D. Methods for Evaluating and Ranking Applications	
III.E. Submission Deadline and Location for Submission	
III.F. Other Requirements	
Application and Proposal Submittal Information (Section IV).....	Pages 13-23
IV.A. Agency Contact	
IV.B. Instructions for Submission of Project Proposal	
IV.C. Proposal Submittal Requirements	
IV.D. Budget Proposal Instructions	
Application Review Information (Section V).....	Pages 24-34
V.A. Evaluation and Ranking Criteria	
Award Administration Information (Section VI).....	Pages 34-36
VI.A. Award Notices	
VI.B. Award Document	
VI.C. Reporting Requirements	
Other Information (Section VII).....	Page 36

**Central Valley Project Conservation Program and Central Valley Project Improvement Act
Habitat Restoration Program**

**Department of the Interior / U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Bureau of Reclamation Pacific Southwest Region
Mid Pacific Region
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825**

OVERVIEW

Agency Names:	Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Sacramento, California
Funding Opportunity Title:	Central Valley Project Conservation Program and Central Valley Project Improvement Act Habitat Restoration Program
Announcement Type:	Initial announcement
Funding Opportunity Application (FOA) No.:	R10AF20001
Application Due Date:	Applications due November 13, 2009 , 3:00 p.m. Pacific Standard Time (PST)
Eligible Applicants:	As described in Section III.A.
Program Authority:	Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as amended, 16 U.S.C. Section 661 et seq, of 1956; Public Law 102-575, Central Valley Project Improvement Act, Title XXXIV, 3406(b)(1)
Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number	15.512
Cost Share:	No cost sharing requirement, but level of partnering is considered during proposal evaluation. See "Partners" criterion under section V.A. Evaluation and Ranking Criterion #11
Estimated number of agreements to be awarded	10 – 15. Funds may range from \$5,000 to \$1,000,000 on approved projects.
Total amount of funding available for FY10:	Estimated \$3,000,000.00

PROPOSAL CHECKLIST

While it is in the applicant's best interest to read this entire FOA, the following table contains a summary of the information that you are required to submit.

SUBMIT ONE ORIGINAL AND THREE PAPER COPIES			
What to Submit		Required Content	REQUIRED FORM OR FORMAT
	Cover Page	See Sec IV.C.1.	Name of Requestor, Organization Name, Title of Project and date
	First Page	See Sec. IV.C.2.	Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Standard Form (SF) 424*, Application for Federal Assistance
	Assurances	See Sec. IV.C.3.	OMB SF 424B* or SF 424D*, as applicable
	Written Project Proposal	See Sec. IV.C.4.	Written proposal in accordance with specified format in this section.
	Regulatory Compliance	See Sec. IV.C.6.	Applicants are required to comply with all applicable local, state, and Federal environmental, cultural, and paleontological resource protection laws and regulations.
	Budget Information	Sec. IV.D.	OMB SF 424A* Budget Information (Non-Construction Programs) or SF 424C* Budget Information (Construction Programs), as applicable
	Budget Narrative	Sec. IV.D.	Describe in sufficient detail how each budget item relates to the project activity, and provide clear rationale/breakdown for the amount of each budget item. Award will not be made to any applicant who fails to provide budget narrative information.
	Budget Table	Sec. IV.D.	Use the table in Attachment B as a budget template. The activity budget should include sufficient detailed information to enable Reclamation and the Service to evaluate the reasonableness of the budgeted amount.
*FORMS MAY BE DOWNLOADED FROM WWW.GRANTS.GOV UNDER THE FUNDING OPPORTUNITY, R10AF20001, <u>FULL ANNOUNCEMENT</u> OR <u>APPLICATION</u>			

SECTION I – GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

The Central Valley Project Conservation Program (CVPCP) was developed during the Endangered Species Act Section 7 consultation process to ensure that the existing operation of the Central Valley Project (CVP), implementation of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA), and renewal of CVP water service contracts would not jeopardize listed or proposed species or adversely affect designated or proposed critical habitat. Accordingly, the CVPCP implements actions that will protect, restore, and enhance special-status species and their habitats affected by the CVP, with a special emphasis on federally listed species. The CVPIA Habitat Restoration Program (HRP) was established under Title XXXIV, Section 3406 (b) (1) of the CVPIA. The HRP also implements actions to improve conditions for species impacted by the CVP.

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) funds may range from \$5,000 to \$1,000,000 on approved projects.

1.B. PROGRAM AUTHORITY

This Funding Opportunity Application is issued in accordance with the authority of Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as amended, 16 U.S.C. Section 661 et seq, of 1956; Public Law 102-575, Central Valley Project Improvement Act, Title XXXIV, Section 3406(b)(1).

I.C. PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

Open solicitation of grant opportunities through the CVPCP and HRP will facilitate meeting the objectives of the programs. Public outreach and solicitation helps ensure the programs receive a sufficient volume of quality proposals carrying out conservation actions pursuant to the programs' short- and long-term goals.

I.D. OBJECTIVE OF FUNDING OPPORTUNITY APPLICATION

The objective of the competitive solicitation is to ensure compliance with competition requirements related to Federal financial agreements and to ensure public participation in the CVPCP and HRP.

I.D.1. Evaluation Criteria. See Section V of this FOA.

I.E. ELIGIBLE PROJECTS

DESCRIPTION OF ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAM PRIORITY ACTIONS

The CVPCP and HRP fund a variety of actions that improve conditions for species and habitats impacted by the CVP, recognizing that a balanced set of actions is needed to meet the stated objectives. The CVPCP and HRP have, however, placed emphasis on certain kinds of activities considered more critical to species' protection and recovery than others. A list of projects previously funded by the programs can be found on the programs' website: www.usbr.gov/mp/cvpcp. Funds are generally distributed as indicated below for the following activities:

- 1) Fee Title/Easement Acquisition: Protection of species or existing habitats impacted by the CVP through the purchase of fee title or conservation easements on lands where threats to these lands are significant. Approximately 60-80 percent of CVPCP and HRP funds are directed towards this proposed activity.

- 2) Habitat Restoration: Restoration of CVP-impacted habitats where restoration actions will markedly improve conditions for impacted species. Approximately 10-20 percent of CVPCP and HRP funds are directed towards this proposed activity.
- 3) Research: Research addressing status, habitat needs, and behavior of CVP-impacted species that will facilitate species recovery. Approximately 10-20 percent of CVPCP and HRP funds are directed towards this proposed activity.

Fiscal Year 2010 Priority Actions

The CVPCP and HRP have established priority actions related to species, habitats, and geographic areas. Well-conceived and clearly written proposals that address the priority actions listed below will be given preference during proposal review. These priority actions have been developed specifically for fiscal year 2010. They reflect the most current evaluation of species needs and habitat trends and are complementary to other on-going conservation actions within the Central Valley. They also take into account historical levels of investment by the Programs, as well as future threats to specific ecosystems. The priority actions are listed in order of preference within each activity category. The number of points assigned to each Program Priority Action (see criterion #3 on page 24) within each category is indicated in parentheses below. Additionally and as applicable, proposals should emphasize priority one and two tasks found in the Recovery Plans associated with the species and habitats listed below:

A. Acquisition Priority Actions

Parcels proposed for acquisition that have documented occurrences of CVP-impacted federally listed species will likely rank higher than those that do not. ***NOTE: Appraisals of parcels for proposed fee title or conservation easement acquisition must be completed under the supervision of the Department of Interior's (DOI) Appraisal Service's Directorate (ASD) to ensure appraisals meet DOI standards. Appraisals submitted without DOI/ASD guidance will most likely not be approved.**

1. *Serpentine soil and associated habitats supporting endemic species, such as the bay checkerspot butterfly and serpentine plants, in Santa Clara County.* For this habitat and geographic priority, the CVPCP and HRP will consider proposals that protect, through fee title or conservation easement acquisition, and preserve existing habitat and provide for the protection and management of occupied habitat as well as unoccupied serpentine grasslands that act as corridors or stepping stones between known populations of bay checkerspot butterfly and other listed serpentine species. Proposals should emphasize implementation of priority one and two tasks for serpentine species found in the Implementation Schedule in the *Recovery Plan for Serpentine Soil Species of the San Francisco Bay Area* (USFWS 1998a). (8 points)
2. *Additional land to contribute to Antioch Dunes National Wildlife Refuge in Contra Costa County.* Land contiguous with the eastern boundary of the Sardis Unit of the Refuge is occupied by three federally-listed species: the Contra Costa wallflower, the Antioch Dunes evening primrose, and the Lange's metalmark butterfly. The CVPCP and HRP will consider proposals that acquire and preserve the existing habitat for these species on a 5- to 10-acre strip bordering the eastern edge of the Sardis Unit. This continuous land would also serve as a buffer to the Sardis Unit. Proposals should provide assurances that the site will be restored and managed properly for the listed species, however, the site cleanup (site was formerly part of a chemical factory) will not be funded by these programs. Proposals should emphasize implementation of the *Revised Recovery Plan for Three Endangered Species Endemic to Antioch Dunes, California* (USFWS 1984). (7 points)

3. *Habitat protection activities in eastern Alameda County that will help conserve CVP-impacted listed species located there.* Priority will be given to conservation actions that protect, through fee title or conservation easement acquisition (a) chaparral/grassland/oak savannah matrix important for Alameda whipsnake feeding, breeding, dispersal, and movement; (b) habitat that provides breeding, dispersal, and colonization opportunities for California tiger salamander; (c) aquatic breeding and upland movement/aestivation habitat for California red-legged frog; and (d) vernal pool habitat that supports listed crustaceans. Proposals should emphasize implementation of appropriate recovery tasks for Alameda County species found in the following recovery plans: *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California* (USFWS 1998b), *Draft Recovery Plan for Chaparral and Scrub Community Species East of San Francisco Bay, California* (USFWS 2002a), *Recovery Plan for the California Red-legged Frog* (USFWS 2002b), and *Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon* (USFWS 2005). (6 points)
4. *Vernal pool habitats supporting federally listed vernal pool invertebrates, California tiger salamander, and listed plant species including slender Orcutt grass, Greene's tuctoria, Colusa grass, Hoover's spurge, and fleshy-owl's clover.* Actions will be considered that protect, through fee title or conservation easement acquisition, existing natural vernal pool complexes supporting listed species in Zone 1 and Zone 2 Core Areas (especially sites that are known to be inhabited by narrowly endemic federally-listed species). Where possible, proposals should consider protecting lands that will compliment existing protected lands and contribute to protection of contiguous blocks of habitat. Proposals should emphasize implementation of appropriate priority one and two tasks found in the Implementation Schedule of the *Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon* (USFWS 2005) for the following Zone 1 and 2 Core Areas: Chico, Doe Mill, Cosumnes/Rancho Seco, Mather, Merced, Madera, San Joaquin, Western Placer County, and Grasslands Ecological. (5 points)
5. *San Joaquin Valley floor habitat and rangeland protection.* Acquire through fee title or conservation easement alkali sink, alkali scrub, and valley grassland habitat located on the floor of the San Joaquin Valley that contributes to the core and satellite population areas and habitat linkages and corridors for San Joaquin kit fox, blunt-nosed leopard lizard, Tipton kangaroo rat, giant kangaroo rat, Fresno kangaroo rat, Buena Vista Lake shrew, federally-listed plant species, particularly Bakersfield cactus, Hartweg's golden sunburst, palmate-bracted bird's-beak and other species dependent upon this habitat complex. For the kit fox, areas to be considered for land acquisition are the Panoche and Pleasant Valley areas. Other areas in which protection is to be considered include lands north of Carrizo Plain National Monument, western Fresno County, Madera County, and area around Santa Nella, Los Banos and Tracy where linkages between occupied habitats are in danger of being lost. Proposals should emphasize implementation of priority one and two tasks as described in Tables 5 and 7 for the species found in the *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California* (USFWS 1998b). (4 points)
6. *Wetland and associated uplands supporting the giant garter snake.* Actions will be considered that protect habitat, through fee title acquisition or conservation easement. Proposals should emphasize implementation of priority one and two tasks found in the *Draft Recovery Plan for the Giant Garter Snake* (1990). (3 points)

The following lands will be considered:

A. Suitable habitat in the Northern American Basin (Yuba River south to Natomas Cross Canal and east of Hwy 99/70); Natomas Basin: protect and restore habitat in minimum blocks of 162 hectares (400 acres) in accordance with the Natomas Basin HCP and the Metro Air

Park HCP.

B. San Joaquin Valley - Corridors hydrologically connecting the four known sub-population centers, and the Mendota WA sub-population: connecting the San Luis NWR and the Volta WA.; connecting the San Luis NWR and the Los Banos WA; and connecting Los Banos WA with Mendota WA.

C. Buena Vista Lake Area - If survey results show presence of giant garter snakes, protect suitable habitat in vicinity of Kern Water Bank and Burrell/Lanare Area.

7. *Wetland and associated uplands supporting species such as giant garter snake, riparian and other aquatic habitat supporting riparian brush rabbit, riparian woodrat, California red-legged frog, valley elderberry longhorn beetle, southwest willow flycatcher, and least Bell's vireo, with a special emphasis on the San Joaquin Valley.* Actions will be considered that protect habitat, through fee title acquisition or conservation easement. Proposals should emphasize implementation of appropriate priority one and two tasks for species found in the *Draft Recovery Plan for the Giant Garter Snake* (1990), *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California* (USFWS 1998b), *Recovery Plan for the California Red-legged Frog* (USFWS 2002b), *Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle Recovery Plan* (USFWS 1984), *Draft Recovery Plan for Least Bell's Vireo* (USFWS 1998c), and *Southwestern Willow Flycatcher Recovery Plan* (USFWS 2002c). (2 points)
8. Other fee title or conservation easement acquisitions that address CVPCP/HRP goals of protecting, enhancing, and restoring CVP-impacted federally listed species populations and their habitats within the CVPCP/HRP project area map boundary. See the CVPCP and HRP website for priority habitat types and species included in these programs:
<http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvpcp/species/index.html> (1 point)

B. Restoration Priority Actions

1. *Serpentine soil and associated habitats supporting endemic species, such as the bay checkerspot butterfly and serpentine plants, in Santa Clara County.* For this habitat and geographic priority, the CVPCP and HRP are particularly interested in proposals that emphasize restoration of degraded habitat by reintroduction of grazing, protection from overgrazing, etc. Proposals should emphasize priority one and two tasks for serpentine species found in the Implementation Schedule of the *Recovery Plan for Serpentine Soil Species of the San Francisco Bay Area* (USFWS 1998a). (7 points)
2. *Continuation of the Lange's metalmark captive breeding program and for continued restoration of riverine dune habitat at the Antioch Dunes National Wildlife Refuge.* Actions will be considered that provide for maintaining labor, supplying nursery services to raise and out-plant, the two listed plants (Antioch Dunes evening primrose and Contra Costa wallflower, and the non-listed Lange's metalmark host plant, auriculate naked-stemmed buckwheat), removing invasive plants, and for purchasing and distributing suitable sand ground cover. Proposals should clearly define and establish criteria for project completion, and estimate when these completion criteria are expected to be met. Proposals should emphasize priority one and two tasks for these species identified in the *Revised Recovery Plan for Three Endangered Species Endemic to Antioch Dunes, California* (USFWS 1980). (6 points)
3. *San Joaquin Valley ecosystem restoration that results in the following vegetation types: alkali sink, alkali scrub, and valley grassland habitat.* Restoration located in the San Joaquin Valley that contributes to species recovery will be prioritized. The restoration effort should benefit core and satellite population areas and emphasize habitat connectivity for the following

federally-listed animal and plant species: San Joaquin kit fox, blunt-nosed leopard lizard, Tipton kangaroo rat, giant kangaroo rat, Fresno kangaroo rat, Buena Vista Lake shrew, California jewelflower, palmate-bracted bird's beak, Kern mallow, San Joaquin woolly-threads, and Bakersfield cactus. Areas selected for restoration should demonstrate presence of one or more of the species noted above. Restoration efforts should also benefit habitat linkages and corridors of the listed animal species. Proposals should emphasize priority one and two tasks for these species found in the *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California* (USFWS 1998b). (5 points)

4. *Habitat restoration activities in eastern Alameda County and eastern Contra Costa County that will help conserve CVP-impacted listed species located there.* Projects will be considered that protect (a) chaparral/grassland/oak savannah matrix important for Alameda whipsnake feeding, breeding, dispersal, and movement; (b) habitat that provides breeding, dispersal, and colonization opportunities for California tiger salamander; (c) aquatic breeding and upland movement/aestivation habitat for California red-legged frog; (d) vernal pool habitat that supports listed crustaceans; and (e) grassland habitats used by San Joaquin kit fox that provide regional linkage between Contra Costa County and areas outside the County, and Alameda County and areas outside the County. Proposals should emphasize implementation of appropriate priority one and two tasks for Alameda County and Contra Costa County species found in the following recovery plans: *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California* (USFWS 1998b), *Draft Recovery Plan for Chaparral and Scrub Community Species East of San Francisco Bay, California* (USFWS 2002a), *Recovery Plan for the California Red-legged Frog* (USFWS 2002b), and *Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon* (USFWS 2005). (4 points)
5. *Restore wetlands, riparian habitat, and associated uplands supporting species such as the giant garter snake, riparian brush rabbit, and riparian woodrat within the historic range of these species in the San Joaquin Valley.* Actions should emphasize large-scale habitat connectivity. Additionally, actions will be considered that restore habitat and establish refugia for species in flood zones. Proposals should emphasize implementation of appropriate priority one and two tasks for species found in the following recovery plans: *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California* (USFWS 1998b) and *Draft Recovery Plan for the Giant Garter Snake* (USFWS 1999). (3 points)
6. *Restore and prepare potential habitat for outplanting of *Fremontodendron californicum* ssp. *decumbens* (Pine Hill flannelbush), and *Galium californicum* ssp. *sierrae* (El Dorado bedstraw) in protected suitable habitat.* These species are the most restricted of the listed plants endemic to gabbro soils included in the *Recovery Plan for Gabbro Soil Plants of the Central Sierra Nevada Foothills* (USFWS 2002d). The introduction of an additional occurrence of the flannelbush and of the El Dorado bedstraw is recommended in the Recovery Plan in suitable protected habitat within the Salmon Falls/Martel Creek Preserve. In addition to preparation for planting, the site and the occurrence will need subsequent monitoring and management. In addition to the general ranking criteria, proposals will be judged on site selection and strength of post-outplanting monitoring strategy. Proposals should emphasize implementation of appropriate priority one and two tasks for species found in the *Recovery Plan for Gabbro Soil Plants of the Central Sierra Nevada Foothills* (USFWS 2002d). (2 points)
7. Other habitat restoration or enhancement that address CVPCP/HRP goals of protecting, enhancing, and restoring CVP-impacted federally listed species populations and their habitats within the CVPCP/HRP project area map boundary. See the CVPCP and HRP website for priority habitat types and species included in these programs:

<http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvpcp/species/index.html> (1 point)

C. Research Priority Actions

Research activities must include a clear and detailed study methodology. All research proposals will be subjected to additional scrutiny by being evaluated by experts in the scientific community on the various research topics that are received. Additionally, multi-year projects are encouraged to ensure adequate data collection. If projects are multi-year, the budget should be itemized for each year of research. Multi-year projects will be considered based on prior performance and funding availability. Permitting should be addressed, if appropriate.

1. *Develop captive propagation techniques for listed species endemic to serpentine soil and associated habitats supporting endemic species in Santa Clara County.* Proposals will be considered that develop captive propagation techniques for the bay checkerspot butterfly, nectar plants of the bay checkerspot butterfly, and propagation techniques for listed plants. Proposals should emphasize appropriate priority one and two tasks in the Implementation Schedule for serpentine species found in the *Recovery Plan for Serpentine Soil Species of the San Francisco Bay Area* (USFWS 1998a). (7 points)
2. *Map and quantify the acreage of currently occupied and suitable habitat, and occupied and suitable habitat that was present in 2005 (the time that the recovery plan was published), within core areas for all species covered in the Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon (USFWS 2005).* Core areas located in Sacramento, Placer, and Merced Counties have the highest priority. Successful proposals will integrate previous mapping efforts. Analysis methods must be applicable to all species and core areas. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office's GIS branch should be consulted during project design in order to ensure all work products will be consistent with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service GIS needs. (6 points)
3. *Captive propagation and reintroduction of riparian brush rabbit.* The ongoing riparian rabbit recovery project on the San Joaquin River National Wildlife Refuge and other lands is the primary recovery effort for this species (one of the most endangered mammals in California). Extensive land acquisition, riparian woodland restoration, flood refugia construction, and endangered species recovery work have been completed over the past decade. However, additional funding is needed for the continuation of the successful captive propagation and reintroduction work including captive propagation, health screening, reintroduction, monitoring of collared and tagged rabbits, habitat assessments, and reporting. Proposals should emphasize priority 1 and 2 tasks in the Implementation Schedule found in the *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California* (USFWS 1998b). (5 points)
4. *Continuation of status survey for giant garter snake at White Slough Wildlife Area, San Joaquin County.* The products for this survey would be GIS maps showing location of surveys, a written description of the site (including discussion of any habitat conversion), and species status information including numbers of individuals, size of occupied area, reproductive status, habitat condition, and any observed threats. This survey would expand upon and complement the first status survey at White Slough. A detailed discussion of survey methods and timing of surveys needs to be included for the species. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office's GIS branch should be consulted during project design in order to ensure all work products will be consistent with U.S. Fish

and Wildlife Service GIS needs. Proposals should emphasize implementation of appropriate tasks shown in the *Draft Recovery Plan for the Giant Garter Snake* (USFWS 1999). (4 points)

5. *Develop information on adult movement behavior and long-term trends in the population dynamics of the Central population of the California tiger salamander.* There is a critical need for reliable information on the population dynamics of the California tiger salamander over the long term. The study should examine and evaluate relevant aspects of the subadults and adults, including, but not limited to the distances individuals move to and from their breeding ponds, number of times single animals migrate to the breeding pond over their life span, and survivorship of individuals and cohorts. Marking or otherwise distinguishing individual animals using a non-injurious method should be utilized to evaluate how this species uses a site and inhabits landscapes over time, and to measure short- and long-term population and ecological trends at a single site and possible correlation to large-scale environmental events. (3 points)
6. *Provide information on riparian woodrat distribution, demography and habitat requirements to further its recovery at San Joaquin River National Wildlife Refuge.* Relatively little is known about the endangered riparian woodrat (*Neotoma fuscipes riparia*), especially on the San Joaquin River National Wildlife Refuge. Basic information on distribution, abundance and habitat associations is needed to guide management of the San Joaquin River National Wildlife Refuge. Required products from this research project include non-invasive surveying and mapping of existing populations (on- and off-Refuge), population estimates, habitat definition, development of GIS layers of vegetation types, existing habitat connectivity and a predictive habitat model (of habitat and habitat connectivity). The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office's GIS branch should be consulted during project design in order to ensure all work products will be consistent with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service GIS needs. No disturbance of nests or collection of nest material will be authorized. Proposals should emphasize recommended conservation actions and Priority 1 and 2 tasks found in the *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California* (USFWS 1998b). (2 points)

LITERATURE CITED

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1980. Revised Recovery Plan for Three Endangered Species Endemic to Antioch Dunes, California. Approved March 21, 1980, and Revised April 25, 1984. Portland, Oregon.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1984. Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle Recovery Plan. Portland, Oregon. 62 pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1998a. Recovery Plan for Serpentine Soil Species of the San Francisco Bay Area. Portland, Oregon. 330+ pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1998b. Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California. Portland, Oregon. 319 pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1998c. Draft Recovery Plan for Least Bell's Vireo. Portland, Oregon.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1999. Draft Recovery Plan for the Giant Garter Snake. Portland, Oregon. ix + 192 pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002a. Draft Recovery Plan for Chaparral and Scrub Community Species East of San Francisco Bay, California. Region 1, Portland, Oregon. xvi + 306 pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002b. Recovery Plan for the California red-legged frog (*Rana*

aurora draytonii). Portland, Oregon. viii + 173 pp.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002c. Southwest Willow Flycatcher Recovery Plan. Portland, Oregon.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002d. Recovery Plan for Gabbro Soil Plants of the Central Sierra Nevada Foothills. Portland, Oregon. xiii + 220 pp.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2005. Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon. Portland, Oregon. xxvi + 606 pp.

SECTION II -- AWARD INFORMATION

II.A. PROJECT FUNDING LIMITATIONS

The number of agreements awarded is dependent on the total amount of funding requested by successful proposals. Total estimated funding for the program for fiscal year 2010 is \$3 million.

Reclamation and Service funds may range from \$5,000 to \$1,000,000 on approved projects.

II.B. RECLAMATION and SERVICE RESPONSIBILITIES

If substantial involvement between Reclamation/Service and the Recipient is anticipated during the performance of the project, the anticipated award instrument will be a cooperative agreement. In support of this agreement, Reclamation/Service will provide the following:

Reclamation/Service shall collaborate and participate with the Recipient in the management of the project and closely oversee the Recipient's activities to ensure that the program objectives are being achieved as per the cooperative agreement. This oversight shall include review, input, and approval at key interim stages of the project as identified in the Recipient's proposal.

If substantial involvement is not anticipated on the part of Reclamation/Service, the financial assistance instrument will be a grant.

Reclamation/Service retains the rights to make awards using either grants or cooperative agreements instruments.

The proposal must demonstrate public benefit for financial assistance agreements.

II.C. AWARD DATE

Applicants should be notified by no later than May 2010 on whether or not their proposal(s) was selected for funding. It is anticipated that awards will be made on or before **September 2010**.

SECTION III – ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

III.A. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

Applicants eligible under this Funding Opportunity Application include State or Local government agencies, private non-profit or profit organizations, individuals, and educational institutions.

Federal agencies may apply to the CVPCP and HRP Programs for project funding under the provisions of this FOA but are excluded from the granting process. Proposals submitted by Federal Agencies will be evaluated using criteria applied to other eligible applicants, however Federal agency proposals selected for funding will be exercised under separate interagency funding instruments.

III.B. COST SHARE GUIDELINES

There is no cost sharing requirement, but partnering is highly encouraged and the level of partnering is considered during proposal evaluation. Refer to the ranking guidelines in Section V.A, Evaluation and Ranking Criterion #11.

III.C. EVALUATION CRITERIA and WEIGHTING: Refer to Section V

III.D. METHODS for EVALUATING and RANKING APPLICATIONS:

All proposal applications are reviewed and ranked by a CVPCP & HRP Technical Team, comprised of State and Federal agency biologists and program managers. Technical Team members utilize ranking criteria described in Section V.A to evaluate proposals and determine which proposals should be selected for funding. Selected applications are also approved by Reclamation and Service Management staff.

III.E. SUBMISSION DEADLINE and LOCATION for SUBMISSION:

Submission deadline is November 13, 2009 at 3:00 p.m. PST. The proposal application should be sent to Maria E. Castaneda, MP-3813, Bureau of Reclamation, 2800 Cottage Way, Room E-1815, Sacramento, CA 95825-1898. See Section IV.B. for instructions on proposal submission.

III.F. OTHER REQUIREMENTS

III.F.1. SF 424 (Cover Page) and Assurances

The applicant must submit these required forms in accordance with the requirements stated in Section IV of this document.

III.F.2. Project and Budget Proposals

The applicant must submit project and budget proposals in accordance with the requirements stated in Section IV of this document.

III.F.3. Other Regulations

Applicants shall adhere to Federal, State, and local laws, regulations, and codes, as applicable, and shall obtain all required approvals and permits. Applicants shall also coordinate and obtain approvals from site owners and operators. See Section IV.C.6. for additional information regarding environmental and regulatory compliance and approvals.

SECTION IV – APPLICATION AND PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL INFORMATION

IV.A. AGENCY CONTACT

IV.A.1. Interested organizations or individuals are requested to submit their questions pertaining to this FOA to the Grants Officer by:

E-mail: mcastaneda@usbr.gov

Mail:

Bureau of Reclamation
Mid-Pacific Region
Attn: Maria E. Castaneda
2800 Cottage Way, MP-3813
Sacramento CA 95825-1898

RECLAMATION:

Mr. John Thomson/MP-152
CVP Conservation Program/HRP Manager
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento CA 95825-1898
(916) 978-5052
Email: jthomson@usbr.gov

SERVICE:

Ms. Caroline Prose/HRP Manager
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Pacific Southwest Region
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento CA 95825
(916) 414-6575
Email: caroline_prose@fws.gov

I.V.A.2. Interested organizations or individuals having difficulties accessing forms/electronic addresses, or questions pertaining to the Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, may contact Maria E. Castaneda at (916) 978-5148 or via email at mcastaneda@usbr.gov.

IV.B. INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMISSION OF PROJECT PROPOSAL

IV.B.1. Submit one original and three paper copies. Each applicant shall submit proposals in accordance with the instructions contained in this section. Detailed instructions for each element are set forth immediately below.

Applications must be submitted as a complete package. Materials arriving separately will not be included in the application package for consideration and may result in the application being rejected or not funded. Mailing materials, package, or packing envelopes of the proposal must reference the **FOA number R10AF20001. FAX copies of proposal documents will not be accepted.**

Do not include a cover letter or company literature/brochure with your proposal. All pertinent information must be included in your Project and Budget Proposals in accordance with the formats described below.

Proposals shall be submitted initially in hard copy only and addressed as follows (electronic or facsimile transmissions of proposals will NOT be accepted):

Mailing Address:

Bureau of Reclamation
Mid-Pacific Region
Attn: Maria E. Castaneda, MP-3813
2800 Cottage Way, Room E-1815
Sacramento CA 95825-1898

Following initial submission, applicants should be prepared to submit electronic copies of

proposals (in PDF and Word format) upon request.

IV.B.2. Deadline for Receipt of Proposals

Proposals will be accepted until 3:00 p.m., Pacific Standard Time, on November 13, 2009. Proposals received after this date and time will not be considered for award.

IV.C. PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

IV.C.1. Cover Page. Include the name of the requestor, organization name, title of project and date

IV.C.2. First Page – The first page shall consist of a fully completed SF 424 - Application for Federal Assistance. This form must be signed by a person legally authorized to commit your organization to performance of the activity and who will be the official point of contact during the application process. **Inclusion of a properly signed and dated SF 424 in your proposal is a mandatory requirement. Failure to adhere to this requirement will result in the elimination of your proposal from further consideration.** This form may be downloaded from www.grants.gov under the Funding Opportunity R10AF20001, **Full Announcement** or **Application**.

IV.C.3. Assurances – Include with your proposal a completed and signed SF 424B – Assurances – Non-Construction Programs or an SF 424D – Assurances – Construction Programs. This form must be signed by a person legally authorized to commit your organization to performance of the activity. **Inclusion of a properly signed and dated SF 424B or SF 424D in your proposal is a mandatory requirement. Failure to adhere to this requirement will result in the elimination of your proposal from further consideration.** These forms may be downloaded from www.grants.gov under the Funding Opportunity, R10AF20001, **Full Announcement** or **Application**.

IV.C.4. Written Project Proposal

- Below is the format that all applicants must adhere to when submitting a project proposal.
- Proposals must have a page number on every page.
- All proposals will be evaluated and ranked on their technical merit and completeness. Applicants should submit well described and technically accurate proposal packages organized in the following format.

Format:

- I. Title of Project (*state the title of the project*)
- II. Abstract (*submit a brief abstract in standard abstract format*)
- III. Proposal Category (*list the activity category, e.g., Acquisition, Restoration, or Research*)
- IV. Project Objective(s) (*clearly state the objective(s) that the project should achieve when fully implemented*)
- V. Proposal Proponent (*provide name, address, phone number, fax number, and email address of main/primary technical point of contact person*).

- VI. Location of Project *(All project proposals should include a clear and detailed map indicating local reference points and location within the CVPCP and HRP project area boundary (see website for CVPCP and HRP Project Area Map at www.usbr.gov/mp/cvpcp/program_cvp/index.html). Also include photographs of the project site, if applicable. For acquisition and restoration projects, include a detailed legal description - Township, Range, Meridian, Section - of the project location, including size in acre(s) of project area.)*
- VII. Amount of Funding Request *(specify funds requested from the CVPCP/HRP)*
- VIII. Total Project Cost *(specify total estimated cost of the project including in-kind and cost-share contributions)*
- IX. Proposed Activities *(for the action being proposed for funding, provide a detailed description and clear tasks to be accomplished including, but not limited to, the following):*
- Provide any relevant background information, such as species biology, surrounding land-uses, etc.
 - State the type(s) of habitat and the number of acres that would be acquired or restored if funded (for acquisition or restoration proposals)
 - Provide enough information about potential effects from the project, so that the impact analysis can be facilitated and the compliance requirements can be satisfied; the proposal should have enough detail to assess whether proposed goals can be achieved. (Examples of questions for restoration that may need to be answered are: What are the dimensions of the area to be disturbed? Where will fill be obtained? Where will soil be dumped? Will you be moving dirt to a relatively undisturbed area? etc. Provide written descriptions, maps and figures as necessary).
 - Discuss and provide citations for any previous efforts and pre-existing data related to the project.
 - Discuss and clearly describe field techniques, study design, type of data collection, survey methodology and statistical methods, type of analysis being conducted, etc. (for research proposals).
 - Answer the question: Why is this project needed?
- X. Project Timeline *(include milestones and final completion date for each task).*
- XI. Existing Habitat and Species Baseline Conditions *(describe habitat conditions and species occurrences on the project site. Include citations of biological surveys that can verify these conditions and occurrences. Conditions should be described for Federal and State listed species as well as other Federal and State designated species).*
- XII. Measuring Results *(describe how the results of the project would be measured when implemented. Examples of project results that could be measured are species survival, numbers of individuals detected during surveys, increases in baseline conditions, etc. If applicable, describe circumstances of known land access vs. unknown land access. For example, describe which lands have access granted and which lands do not. Address how potentially not obtaining access to lands will affect the results of the research. Specify how much (percentage) of the surveys, etc. needs to be conducted on private lands vs. public lands).*
- XIII. Resume *(provide a one-page resume for each person who would be significantly involved in the project).*

XIV. Relationship to Program Ranking Criteria

a. Describe how the proposal will address the following, if applicable:

1. CVP Nexus (indicate the proposal's relationship to the CVP. Proposals must adequately define this relationship to be considered for evaluation. Priority will be given to proposals that are located within a CVP service area, consolidated place of use and/or receive CVP water; see CVPCP and HRP website for Project Area Map).
2. Program Priority Action(s) (per the current fiscal year priority actions for the programs specified in the FOA on www.grants.gov, state which priority action(s) the proposal addresses, and describe how the project relates to the priority action(s)).
3. Federally Listed Species (includes species Proposed for listing) (indicate in as much detail as possible how the project will benefit Federally endangered or threatened species, including species proposed for listing, and how many and which species will benefit. Define and document existing baseline conditions related to federally listed species, and cite all documented references of species occurrence (i.e., results of species' surveys at the project area, reports in the California Department of Fish and Game's Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) that document the presence of a species at or near the proposed project site, written statements by State and/or Federal agency biologists having personal knowledge that a species is present at the proposed site). Provide table listing these species and their status. **Applicants should use the species table example in Attachment A as a template.** Also describe whether the proposed action will address species' recovery plan tasks, which tasks are addressed, and state whether designated "critical habitat" is part of the project). It is highly encouraged that status surveys be conducted prior to submitting a proposal. If the project includes a private land access component, an access agreement should already be obtained, or a convincing description of successful access should be included, in order to accurately describe species benefits.
4. State Listed Species (indicate how State endangered or threatened species, including Rare and Candidate species, may benefit from the project. Apply same provisions as indicated for Federal species and include in a species table. **Applicants should use the species table example in Attachment A as a template.**
5. Other Designated Species (describe how other Federal and State designated species may benefit from the project. These species must be different than those listed under the Federal and State endangered or threatened species categories. Apply same provisions as indicated for Federal and State species and include in a species table. **Applicants should use the species table example in Attachment A as a template.** Other designated species include Federal Candidate Species, State Species of Special Concern and State designated Fully Protected Species.
6. Habitat/Biodiversity (describe vegetation types and species diversity within the project area, and how the project will help maintain or benefit these

components, and the importance of the habitat). For Acquisition and Restoration projects only.

7. Cumulative Benefit *(indicate how the project relates to the collective influence of other on-going or planned activities related to the same species or habitats. For example, identify related CVPCP/HRP-funded projects by searching the project database on the CVPCP and HRP website in addition to listing other-funded, related, on-going or planned activities).*
8. Long-term Benefit *(address how the project benefits might persist or increase over time).*
9. Project Site Connectivity *(describe how the project is physically connected to another protected or restored parcel). For Acquisition and Restoration projects only.*
10. Partners *(Indicate amount of contributions or in-kind services (expressed as dollar amounts) from identified project partners. Specify/distinguish amount of partnering from amount of funding requested from CVPCP and HRP in relation to the total cost of the project. Also specify if funding requested from CVPCP/HRP is being requested concurrently from other sources).*
11. Level of CVP Impacts *(address to what extent a species or habitat was impacted by the CVP).*
12. Project Urgency *(assign a scale of urgency to the action based on the endangerment of a species, the level of threat to a habitat area or the consequence to the species should the project not be carried out. See the CVPCP and HRP website for priority habitat types and species: <http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvpcp/species/index.html>).*

Attachment A

Example of Species Table – This table should be used as a template by applicants.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status ^a	State Status ^b	Other Designated Species ^c	Species Verified Presence (Y/N)
<u>Plants</u>					
Palmate-bracted bird's beak	<i>Cordylanthus palmatus</i>	E	E		
Hairy orcutt grass	<i>Orcuttia pilosa</i>	E	E		
Greene's tuctoria	<i>Tuctoria greenei</i>	E	R		
Hoover's spurge	<i>Chamaesyce hooveri</i>	T			
<u>Invertebrates</u>					
Vernal pool tadpole shrimp	<i>Lepidurus packardii</i>	E			
Conservancy fairy shrimp	<i>Branchinecta conservatio</i>	E			
Vernal pool fairy shrimp	<i>Branchinecta lynchi</i>	T			
<u>Reptiles</u>					
Giant garter snake	<i>Thamnophis gigas</i>	T	T		
Western pond turtle	<i>Clemmys marmorata</i>			CSC	
<u>Birds</u>					
Bald eagle	<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>	delisted	E		
Swainson's hawk	<i>Buteo swainsoni</i>		T		
White-tailed kite	<i>Elanus leucurus</i>			FP	
Burrowing owl	<i>Athene cunicularia</i>			CSC	
White-faced ibis	<i>Plegadis chihi</i>			CSC	
Long-billed curlew	<i>Numenius americanus</i>			CSC	
Loggerhead shrike	<i>Lanius ludovicianus</i>			CSC	
Tricolored blackbird	<i>Agelaius tricolor</i>			CSC	
Northern harrier	<i>Circus cyaneus</i>			CSC	
Short-eared owl	<i>Asio flammeus</i>			CSC	
California horned lark	<i>Eremophila alpestris actia</i>			CSC	

^aE = federally listed as endangered, T= federally listed as threatened, P=federally proposed for listing

^bE = state listed as endangered, R = state listed as rare, T = state listed as threatened, C = state listed as candidate

^cC=federally listed as candidate, CSC = California species of special concern, FP = California fully protected species

IV.C.5. Consistency with State or Local Water Plan – (If applicable) Applicants are required to ensure that the proposed project is consistent with any existing local (i.e. county, municipal or regional) water plan, or with the Bureau of Reclamation criteria for evaluating water management plans available on line at

<http://www.usbr.gov/mp/watershare/documents.html#criteria>.

IV.C.6. Environmental and Regulatory Compliance, Approvals – Applicants are required to comply with all applicable local, state, and Federal environmental, cultural, and paleontological resource protection laws and regulations. These may include, but are not limited to, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), including the Council on Environmental Quality and Department of the Interior regulations implementing NEPA, the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, the National Historic Preservation Act, which requires consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office, and could require consultation with potentially affected Tribes.

Reclamation and the Service are the lead Federal agencies for NEPA compliance. As the lead agencies, they are responsible for determining the appropriate level of NEPA compliance, which could be a categorical exclusions checklist, environmental assessment, or environmental impact statement. However, a project proponent (or their contractor) should provide much of the necessary information and data analyses in order for the agencies to complete NEPA and other regulatory compliance. This information may include specifics about site disturbance, presence of listed species, archeological sites, past or on-going surveys, etc....

In addition, applicants must obtain all required approvals and permits, and shall coordinate and obtain any approvals required from site owners and operators. Applicants should state in their proposals whether any permits or approvals (e.g., land access) are required, and explain the applicant's plan for obtaining such permits or approvals.

Environmental and regulatory compliance costs are addressed in Section IV.D.2g.

IV.D. BUDGET PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS

IV.D.1. General Requirements

The applicant must complete an SF 424A, Budget Information – Non-construction Programs, or an SF 424C, Budget Information, Construction Programs. These forms may be downloaded from www.grants.gov under the Funding Opportunity, R10AF20001, Full Announcement or Application.

The applicant must also include a budget table and narrative with the estimated costs to conduct the proposed activity. The budget table should include the sources and values of in-kind contributions of goods and services as well as funds provided to complete the activity (i.e. include the total cost of the activity, and not only the CVPCH/HRP requested funds).

IV.D.2. Budget Narrative and Table Formats

Provide a detailed budget summary that indicates annual costs by tasks and funding category, and include cost share partners. **Applicants should use the budget table shown below as an example template [Attachment B].**

Budget should be summarized in a table format followed by a complete description of each item. The activity budget should include sufficient **detailed** information to enable the Programs to evaluate the reasonableness of the budgeted amount. Listed below are additional instructions for some budget categories frequently encountered. Not all proposals will have costs in each category. These categories are provided simply as a means to provide instructions regarding the type of information to submit with the budget. If the activity budget includes expenses in these categories, follow the instructions provided. If the activity budget includes expenses in the "Other" category, provide information that describes how the budget amount was estimated, what assumptions it is based upon, etc.

In all cases, sufficient information must be provided to allow a determination that the budget is fair and reasonable for the proposed activity. An award will not be made to any applicant who fails to fully disclose the following information. See Attachment B, Sample Budget Form on Page 23.

IV.D.2a. Salaries and Wages – Identify the personnel, by title, who will conduct the proposed activity. For all identified positions, indicate the estimated hours or percent of time in conducting the activity, and the rate of compensation proposed. All labor estimates, including any proposed subcontractors, shall be allocated to specific tasks as outlined in the Applicant's technical proposal. Labor rates and proposed hours shall be displayed for each task.

Generally, salaries of administrative and/or clerical personnel should be included as a portion of your indirect costs. If these salaries can be adequately documented as direct costs, they may be included in this section; however, an explanation should be included in your budget narrative.

IV.D.2b. Fringe Benefits – Indicate the rate or amount estimated for fringe benefits, the items that are included in this category, and the basis of the rate computations. Indicate whether these rates are used for proposal purposes only or whether they are fixed or provisional rates for billing purposes. Federally-approved rate agreements are acceptable for compliance with this item.

IV.D.2c. Travel – Include the purpose of the trip, destination, number traveling, length of stay, and all travel costs, including air fare, per diem, lodging, and miscellaneous travel expenses. For local travel, include the number of miles and rate per mile. Indicate whether these rates are used for proposal purposes only or whether they are fixed or provisional rates for billing purposes. Federally-approved lodging, miscellaneous and incidental expenses, and mileage rate agreements are acceptable for compliance with this item.

IV.D.2d. Equipment – Identify the type of equipment to be used (or purchased), hourly rate of use (but include the wages for the operator, if any, in the Salaries and Wages category), and estimated number of hours. Include information as to the need for this equipment.

IV.D.2e. Material and Supplies – Itemize material and supplies by major category and purpose, such as office, research, or construction. When possible, identify the unit price and quantity.

IV.D.2f. Contractual – Identify all work that will be accomplished by sub-recipients or consultants, including detailed budget estimate of time, rates, supplies, and materials that will be required for the task. If a sub-recipient or consultant is proposed and approved at the time of award, no other approvals are necessary. Any changes or additions to the approved plan will require a request for approval.

IV.D.2g. Environmental and Regulatory Compliance Costs, Approvals – Reference cost incurred by Reclamation or the applicant in complying with environmental regulations applicable to the CVPCP/HRP, which include NEPA, ESA, NHPA and the Clean Water Act, and other regulations depending on the project, including costs associated with any required permits or approvals.

If tasks involve access to private lands, then land access and project activities on private lands where **access has not yet been obtained** should be shown as separate tasks with separate budget amounts in the budget table, and explained in the budget narrative. Describe how the budget would be affected if access to lands is not granted as anticipated.

IV.D.2h. Other – Any other expense not included in the categories above shall be listed in this category, along with a description of the item and for what it will be utilized. Provide the basis for the estimated cost, assumptions used in the estimate, etc.

IV.D.2i. Profit – **No** profit or fee will be allowed.

IV.D.2j. Indirect Cost - Show the proposed rate, cost base, and proposed amount for allowable indirect costs based on the applicable OMB circular cost principles for the Applicant's organization which include such costs as grant writers, office assistance, administration, utilities and maintenance, and office use expense. It is not acceptable to simply incorporate indirect rates within other direct cost line items. Recipients must obtain and provide a current negotiated indirect cost rate for Federal financial assistance from the National Business Center (NBC), 2180 Harvard St. Suite 430 Sacramento, CA 95815, (916-566-7111) www.nbc.gov/icshome.html. Recipients should submit requests to NBC **at least 6 months** ahead of intended use. If the negotiated indirect cost rate is not obtained prior to the proposal submission, then the applicant should make a good faith effort to estimate their indirect costs in the budget table and explain in the budget narrative.

IV.D.2k. Total Cost – Indicate the total cost of the project, including requested amount from CVPCP/HRP and Federal and non-Federal (partner cost-share and in-kind) amounts.

Attachment B**Sample Budget Table – This form should be used as a template by applicants.**

COST ITEM DESCRIPTION	COMPUTATION		RECIPIENT COST SHARE	CVPCP/HRP FUNDING	TOTAL COST
	Unit/Hr	Quantity			
SALARIES AND WAGES					
Employee 1					
Employee 2					
FRINGE BENEFITS					
Full-time employees					
Part-time employees					
TRAVEL					
Trip 1					
Trip 2					
EQUIPMENT					
Item A					
Item B					
Item C					
SUPPLIES/MATERIALS					
Office Supplies					
Construction					
CONTRACTUAL					
ENVIRONMENTAL AND REGULATORY COMPLIANCE					
OTHER					
Reporting					
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS					
INDIRECT COSTS - ____%					
TOTAL ACTIVITY COSTS			\$	\$	\$

Sources of Funding

Recipient

Cash:

In-Kind Services: _____

Partner (1) _____

Cash:

In-Kind Services: _____

Partner (2) _____

Cash:

In-Kind Services: _____

CVPCP/HRP: _____

Total Activity Funding: _____

SECTION V -- APPLICATION REVIEW INFORMATION

V.A. EVALUATION AND RANKING CRITERIA

Proposals will be evaluated by a multi-agency technical panel in accordance with the criteria listed below. The proposal evaluation and ranking criteria are outlined below, and described in section V.A.2

V.A.1. Evaluation Criteria

(1) **Eligibility to Rank:** Y = yes
N = no

(2) **CVP Nexus:** Y = yes
N = no

(3) **Program Priority Action:** Point # in accordance with priority actions within each activity category

(4) **Federally Listed Species (includes species Proposed for Listing) Benefits:**

0 = Project would result in no benefits to federally listed/proposed species

1-2 = Project would result in **minimal** benefits to federally listed/proposed species

3-4 = Project would result in **moderate** benefits to federally listed/proposed species

5-6 = Project would result in **major** benefits to federally listed/proposed species

(5) **State Listed Species Benefits:**

0 = Project would result in no benefits to State listed species

1 = Project would result in **minimal** benefits to State listed species

2 = Project would result in **moderate** benefits to State listed species

3 = Project would result in **major** benefits to State listed species

(6) **Other Designated Species Benefits:**

0 = Project would result in no benefits to other designated species

1 = Project would result in **minimal** benefits to other designated species

2 = Project would result in **moderate** benefits to other designated species

3 = Project would result in **major** benefits to other designated species

(7) **Habitats/Biodiversity:
(for Acq/Rest proposals)**

0 = none

1-2 = low

3-4 = medium

5-6 = high

- (8) Cumulative Benefit:** 0 = none
1 = low
2 = medium
3 = high
- (9) Long-term Benefit:** 0 = none
1 = low
2 = medium
3 = high
- (10) Project Site Connectivity:** 0 = none
(for Acq/Rest proposals) 1 = low
2 = medium
3 = high
- (11) Partners:** 0 = Other partners bear 0% of the total cost
1 = Other partners bear 1-10% of the total cost
2 = Other partners bear 11-20% of the total cost
3 = Other partners bear 21-30% of the total cost
4 = Other partners bear 31-40% of the total cost
5 = Other partners bear 41-50% of the total cost
6 = Other partners bear 51% or greater of the total cost
- (12) Level of CVP Impacts:** 0 = none
2 = low
4 = medium
6 = high
- (13) Project Urgency:** 0 = none
3 = low
6 = medium
9 = high
- (14) Technical Merit and Completeness of Proposal:**
0 = none
1= low
2= medium
3= high
- (15) Scientific Merit:** 0 = none
(for Research proposals) 3 = low
6 = medium
9 = high
- (16) Acres:** For informational purposes only
- (17) Program Cost:** For informational purposes only
- (18) Total Cost:** For informational purposes only
- (19) Total Points** Sum of all applicable criteria for the proposal

V.A.2. Description of Funding Guidelines and Ranking Criteria

I. Introduction

This document provides a brief description and explanation of funding guidelines and ranking criteria used during evaluation of proposals being considered for funding by the CVPCP and the HRP. Proposals are considered under a single evaluation process for both Programs.

These priorities and criteria grew out of several of the Service's and Reclamation's programs that began planning work and implementing the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) prior to 1995. They include the concerns and priorities that have developed from the implementation of the Friant Biological Opinion in 1992, and Biological Opinions related to CVP contract renewals and Reclamation's Operation Criteria and Plan (OCAP). They further reflect the concerns that have been communicated to the CVPCP and HRP's Technical Team by the management of the offices of the Fish and Wildlife Service (Endangered Species Division), Bureau of Reclamation, and California Department of Fish and Game.

II. General Considerations

The description of guidelines and criteria presented in this FOA are implemented in the context of general considerations of the CVPCP/HRP Technical Team and Program Managers, who can influence final decisions regarding funding. These considerations include:

- 1) Proposals are grouped into three activity categories. These categories reflect the Programs' emphasis on certain kinds of activities considered more effective and critical to species' protection and recovery than others. Accordingly, program funds are applied to proposals in the following order of priority:
 - (A) Fee Title/Easement Acquisition: Protection of species or existing habitats impacted by the CVP through the purchase of fee title or conservation easements.
 - (B) Habitat Restoration: Protection of species or existing habitats impacted by the CVP through restoration of CVP-impacted habitats.
 - (C) Research: Research addressing status, habitat needs, and behavior of CVP-impacted species.
- 2) Actions funded by the CVPCP/HRP are opportunity-driven. Funding decisions are often dependent on the number and scope of proposals received in given year.
- 3) The past performance of an applicant is considered during project selection. Poor performance during implementation of past grant, cooperative or interagency agreements might weigh against further funding.
- 4) Project feasibility is considered during proposal selection. Program managers conclude whether a project will result in real benefits to species in a cost-effective manner before making funding decisions.

III. Proposal Ranking Criteria

Proposals received by the CVPCP and HRP are placed into the three activity categories specified above. Some or all of the criteria described below are applied to those categories, but no other

criteria, other than those listed below, are used.

CRITERION #1 - ELIGIBILITY TO RANK

FOR LAND ACQUISITION (EASEMENT AND/OR FEE TITLE) PROPOSALS

This criterion considers whether or not the proposal merits evaluation and ranking. The technical team will determine this by considering the following: 1) compliance with the terms and conditions of the FOA, and 2) past performance of the project applicant. For example, for compliance with the terms and conditions of the FOA, we will consider whether or not the proposal meets the goals and objectives of the CVPCP and HRP, *etc.* For past performance, we will consider how well the project applicant, as a previous grant recipient, complied with submitting invoices, reports, and other requested information (*e.g.*, Appraisal Report, Recorded Grant Deed, Title Report, Closing Statement) for previous projects in a complete and timely manner; communicated and coordinated on past projects between themselves and the granting agency; complied with the terms and conditions of the previous contract; was responsive to requested information; *etc.*

FOR RESTORATION PROPOSALS

This criterion considers whether or not the proposal merits evaluation and ranking. The technical team will determine this by considering the following: 1) compliance with the terms and conditions of the FOA, and 2) past performance of the project applicant. For example, for compliance with the terms and conditions of the FOA, we will consider whether or not the proposal meets the goals and objectives of the CVPCP and HRP, *etc.* For past performance, we will consider how well the project applicant, as a previous grant recipient, complied with submitting invoices, reports, and other requested information (*e.g.*, Progress Report, Draft Report, Final Report) for previous projects in a complete and timely manner; communicated and coordinated on past projects between themselves and the granting agency; complied with the terms and conditions of the previous contract; was responsive to requested information; *etc.*

FOR RESEARCH PROPOSALS

This criterion considers whether or not the proposal merits ranking. The technical team will determine this by considering the following: 1) compliance with the terms and conditions of the FOA, 2) past performance of the project applicant, 3) results of the technical review, and 4) incorporation of one or more fiscal year priority actions into the proposal. For example, for compliance with the terms and conditions of the FOA, we will consider whether or not the proposal meets the goals and objectives of the CVPCP and HRP, *etc.* For past performance, we will consider how well the project applicant, as a previous grant recipient, complied with submitting invoices, reports, and other requested information (*e.g.*, Progress Report, Draft Report, Final Report) for previous projects in a complete and timely manner; communicated and coordinated on past projects between themselves and the granting agency; complied with the terms and conditions of the previous contract; was responsive to requested information; *etc.* Concerning technical reviews, all research proposals will be subjected to additional scrutiny by being evaluated by experts in the scientific community on the various research topics that are received.

CRITERION #2 - CVP NEXUS

FOR ACQUISITION, RESEARCH, AND RESTORATION PROPOSALS

The criterion considers whether a “nexus” exists between the project proposal and the CVP. Generally a nexus is determined based on two factors:

- 1) Will benefits to a CVP-affected species or resource occur within a CVP contract service area, or in an area where CVP water is delivered following water transfer of sale? See website for CVPCP and HRP Project Area Map.

2) Is there a strong linkage between an affected habitat and/or species (i.e., vernal pools) and the CVP? This would allow, in some cases, for a project area to exist outside a CVP Service Area as long as this linkage between habitat and/or species exists.

This factor is valuable to Reclamation because it provides a higher level of assurance to water users that the conservation needs of resources affected by their district are being addressed in proportion to their share in water surcharge contributions, and thereby serving to make future formal Section 7 consultations easier for actions needed in their district.

It is important to bear in mind that opportunities to most cost-effectively recover a species may not all be found within water districts, but, at the same time, there are recovery actions specifically identified within the CVP service area that should get preference when there are willing sellers or the conditions necessary to move forward are otherwise suitable for implementation of such tasks, and other considerations are equally beneficial to the resource.

CRITERION #3 - PROGRAM PRIORITY ACTION

FOR ACQUISITION, RESTORATION, AND RESEARCH PROPOSALS

This criterion addresses a proposal's relationship to the annual priority actions of the CVPCP/HRP in terms of habitats, species and geographic area identified and ranked for a given year. Each year the Programs establish these priority actions based on past expenditures and existing needs. A proposal that addresses needs within these priority actions will be ranked accordingly, with proposals in higher priority areas receiving more points than those in lower priority areas. Priority actions, and the corresponding pre-assigned number of points, are indicated in the Programs' Funding Opportunity Application on www.grants.gov.

CRITERION #4 - FEDERALLY LISTED SPECIES BENEFITS

FOR ACQUISITION PROPOSALS

This criterion is used to distinguish between projects that have specific benefits to species that are currently federally listed, as opposed to proposals with broader ecological benefits. **Under this criterion, species that are designated as "Proposed" for Federal listing are given the same status as those currently listed.**

The criterion asks the following question: Does the proposal provide a major, moderate, or minimal benefit to federally listed species that have been impacted by the CVP? Parcels proposed for acquisition or restoration which have documented occurrences of federally listed species will likely rank higher than those that do not.

While considering this criterion, the Programs' Technical Team will consult existing Recovery Plans to determine whether an action within a proposal can be correlated with Recovery Plan tasks. This correlation can be used as a tool for determining the scale of benefit that would result from implementation of the proposal.

Additionally, when determining this ranking, reviewers keep in mind that immediacy of threat to a species and the degree of urgency associated with a project, is considered under a separate criteria ("Project Urgency.")

Examples of major, moderate, and minimal benefits are as follows:

For fee title and easement acquisitions, a **major** benefit to federally listed species would result when the land that is acquired consists of the following attributes: Land is in relatively pristine condition and does not need to be restored (e.g., has not been previously degraded or contaminated by

previous land uses and is not dominated by exotic species); land is utilized by numerous federally listed species or any number of critically endangered species; land is comprised of designated critical habitat; and land is not subject to disturbance from adjacent lands (e.g., noise from developed areas, agricultural activities, etc.). A **moderate** benefit to federally listed species would result when the land that is acquired consists of the following attributes: Land is not in pristine condition, needs little restoration, and has not been severely degraded; land is utilized by a moderate number of federally listed species; land may or may not be comprised of designated critical habitat; and land is subject to minimal to very moderate disturbance from adjacent lands. A **minimal** benefit to federally listed species would result when the land that is acquired consists of the following attributes: Land is not pristine and needs moderate to major restoration to address degradation; land is utilized by very few federally listed species or species are not known to be present; land is not comprised of designated critical habitat; and land is subject to moderate to high disturbance from adjacent lands.

FOR RESTORATION PROPOSALS

For restoration projects, a **major** benefit would result when the reviewers determine that the restoration action has the potential to markedly raise the habitat or population baseline for one or more federally listed CVP-impacted species. Examples include creating new and substantial areas of giant garter snake or California red-legged frog habitat in areas that will be readily colonized by the species, or a captive breeding (riparian brush rabbit) or a seed banking program, etc. A **moderate** benefit may be a general habitat restoration project that has some real but not significant benefits to listed species due to the scale and size of the restoration component focused on federally listed species; an example might be a project in which new permanent water areas for garter snake are created, but the additional habitat is considered only a moderate increase due to other limiting factors on the project site. A project with **minimal** benefits might be a restoration project where there are only ancillary benefits to one or more federally listed species, but these benefits are not the main intent of the restoration project (i.e., a wetland restoration project in which minimal/marginal garter snake habitat is created while mainly enhancing conditions for waterfowl, or a riparian project where elderberry will be planted but in areas and at certain densities where it is unlikely to result in VELB colonization). A clear description of the area to be restored, and how success in gaining access will be established, is important in determining benefits to species.

FOR RESEARCH PROPOSALS

For study and survey proposals, a **major** benefit would result if the Technical Team determines that the proposed work provides data that contributes significantly to a species recovery, such as a genetic or behavioral study in which data is used for federally listed species reintroduction, a survey or study that results in changes in the listing status of a species, or a survey where additional populations of individuals are identified where they were once believed to be extirpated. A **moderate** benefit could result if a study or survey provides moderately useful information contributing to recovery, such as new baseline information regarding a species status or distribution. A project with **minimal** benefits would be one in which data obtained might only supplement a large body of preexisting information about a species. Projects must provide a clear and detailed methodology in order for benefits to be accurately determined. If the proposal describes actions on private lands, it is important to convey how success in gaining access will be established and what will be the consequence if access is not granted.

CRITERION #5 - STATE LISTED SPECIES BENEFITS

FOR ACQUISITION, RESTORATION, AND RESEARCH PROPOSALS

This criterion is used to distinguish between projects that have benefits to State listed species, in addition to any other kind of ecological benefit. Parcels proposed for acquisition or restoration, which have documented occurrences of State listed species will likely rank higher than those that do not. Please see descriptions under "Federally Listed Species" section, since those types of benefits would similarly apply to State listed species.

CRITERION #6 – OTHER DESIGNATED SPECIES BENEFITS

FOR ACQUISITION, RESTORATION, AND RESEARCH PROPOSALS

This criterion is used to distinguish between projects that have benefits to species which have some type of State or Federal designated status, but are not State or federally *listed* (or federally proposed) species. These include Federal Candidate Species, State Species of Special Concern, and State designated Fully Protected Species.

CRITERION #7- HABITAT/BIODIVERSITY

FOR ACQUISITION AND RESTORATION PROPOSALS

This criterion is used to distinguish between projects that have benefits to ecosystems that currently support a habitat matrix composed of habitat components that complement each other. These components increase their value in conserving native species beyond what each habitat would do separately, as opposed to projects that would not have that kind of benefit. For example, an acquisition project directed at protecting a variety of vegetative cover types, would receive a higher ranking than one that is focused on one in particular. This criterion is also used to distinguish between projects that have benefits to ecosystems that currently support a large proportion of the native species expected in the habitats to be benefited, particularly in habitats that have greatly declined elsewhere, in addition to other kinds of ecological benefit. It relates to the array of native species on the proposal's project site, and is not limited to listed species. It can apply to proposals that would protect a diverse area and/or increase diversity through restoration. **The key question here is: "Will the proposal benefit or maintain a broad range of native species and habitats, or is it directed at just a few?"** This ranking criterion is not applicable to Study/Survey proposals, since these projects tend to focus on specific habitats related to a particular species.

CRITERION #8 - CUMULATIVE BENEFIT

FOR ACQUISITION PROPOSALS

This criterion considers a project's impact on species/habitats in relation to the collective influence of other on-going or planned activities related to those species and habitats.

An example of a **major** benefit would be a land acquisition project that is part of a larger strategy for a species recovery, such as providing habitat for a species' reintroduction or research. An example of a **moderate** benefit would be one in which changes in land use (e.g. grazing), resulting from the acquisition, would provide moderate benefits for listed species. Another might be one in which some modest, but not comprehensive, restoration work occurs over a number of years. A proposal with **minimal** cumulative benefits would be one in which the proposed action is isolated from other conservation activities, such as a land acquisition in which no restoration or research is planned and the property is not located in areas critical to meeting the species needs (i.e., habitat used incidentally for foraging).

FOR RESTORATION PROPOSALS

An example of projects with **major** cumulative values would be a restoration project that is part of a larger strategy for a species recovery, such as providing habitat for a species' reintroduction or research. An example of a **moderate** benefit might be a fencing project done in conjunction with other land management activities designed to improve conditions for species unless a proposal clearly identified a major benefit through such action. A proposal with **minimal** cumulative benefits would be one in which the proposed action is isolated from other conservation activities, such as a restoration project that is not located in an area critical to meeting the species needs (i.e., habitat used incidentally for foraging).

FOR RESEARCH PROPOSALS

An example of a project with **major** cumulative values would be a study/survey that works in concert with other on-going research directed at a particular species, such as genetics study on California red-legged frog that may provide important information related to reintroducing the species into certain locations. An example of a **moderate** benefit might be a species survey that supplements and enhances relatively current information but does not provide new information considered critical to a species' recovery (e.g. presence or absence of species on newly restored riparian areas). A proposal with **minimal** cumulative benefits would be a project such as a species' inventory in an area generally not seen as an important geographic area for the species and has, therefore, not been emphasized in previous work (e.g. CA red-legged frog surveys in watersheds where frog populations are assumed not to exist).

CRITERION #9 - LONG-TERM BENEFIT**FOR ACQUISITION AND RESTORATION PROPOSALS**

This criterion is used to distinguish between projects that have benefits that are expected to continue in perpetuity, as opposed to projects that address an immediate problem, but will become superfluous to the conservation of Central Valley ecosystems and native species due to later projects and conservation measures.

An example of a **major** benefit would be a project in which the property would be preserved intact and in perpetuity, and where the protected properties have "potential" for supporting additional species. An example of a **moderate to minimal** ranking might be a project in which properties may still be influenced directly or indirectly by future development.

FOR RESEARCH PROPOSALS

An example of a **major** benefit survey/study, might be a vernal pool plant association study which would facilitate and better define mitigation standards for vernal pools. An example of a **moderate to low** ranking might be a resource assessment or population survey that only supplements or reinforces existing data but does not provide significant new information related to the long term sustainability of a population (i.e., use of hair samples to assess distribution and abundance of kit fox).

CRITERION #10 - PROJECT SITE CONNECTIVITY**FOR ACQUISITION AND RESTORATION PROPOSALS**

This criterion is used to distinguish between projects that have synergistic benefits because they benefit habitats that are in proximity to other protected areas, rather than those that are isolated and diminished in value because of that isolation. This criterion applies only to the Acquisition and Restoration categories since these projects relate to actual project sites and locations. This criterion is related to "Cumulative Benefit" but is specific to project location, and does not consider other collective influences on the project's overall impact and effectiveness.

A **major** benefit would result when a project is contiguous to other protected lands and would contribute to securing needed corridors or spatial requirements of species. A **moderate** benefit would result when properties are nearby, but these properties do not represent a continuous band of protected lands. A **minimal** benefit would result if the project property is isolated from other conservation lands.

CRITERION #11 - PARTNERS

FOR ACQUISITION, RESTORATION, AND RESEARCH PROPOSALS

This criterion distinguishes projects for which there will be contributions of cash or in-kind services toward the total cost of the project (not the total requested amount). Project proponents must specify the following in their proposals: (1) specific partners (other than CVPCP/HRP), and (2) specific funding amounts from those partners. This information must be provided in order for partnering levels to be ascertained and counted. Unfunded cost of the project (other than that requested from the CVPCP/HRP) will not be considered as a level of partnering unless the above information is specified. Project applicants are also required to equate in-kind services to dollars, or these services will not be considered when partnering levels are being tallied. This criterion does allow for past contributions to the overall objective of a project. For example, if a proposal seeks funds for the last phase (i.e., maintenance) of a riparian restoration project, funding of earlier phases would be counted when determining partnering levels. It should also be noted that failure to secure funds from other specified sources may jeopardize delivery of funds under a CVPCP/HRP agreement.

Project applicants are highly encouraged to seek other sources of funding along with funding from the CVPCP and/or HRP.

CRITERION #12 - LEVEL OF CVP IMPACTS

FOR ACQUISITION, RESTORATION, AND RESEARCH PROPOSALS

This criterion measures and assesses to what extent a species or ecosystem has been affected by the CVP. It includes direct, indirect, interdependent, and interrelated effects. Species and habitats more affected by the CVP than others will be given more points. The criteria works in conjunction with the "Program Priority Actions" section but is ranked separately since priority actions are also based on level of past expenditures. The Technical Team will evaluate whether the species/habitats benefited by the proposed project have been identified as "high" impact, "medium" impact and "low" impact as related to construction and operation of the CVP. Projects that would rank high for CVP impacts would be those that include habitat types and their associated species that have been the most directly and significantly impacted by the CVP.

The Technical Team will use historical data as a general guide when discussing this criterion, but will consider project location (physical connection to CVP facilities and place of use) in relation to the CVP when determining a final ranking. For example, a riparian restoration project on the perimeter of the CVPCP/HRP project area may not get as high a ranking as one directly adjacent to a CVP facility or within a CVP Service area, even though riparian habitats were significantly impacted by the CVP.

Considering these factors, therefore, proposals will be given a **major** rating if species/habitats being addressed within a project area have been significantly impacted by the CVP, and the project site is within a CVP Service Area or historical place of use. A proposal would receive a **moderate** rating if significantly impacted species are outside a CVP Service Area or historical place of use. Proposals addressing species/habitats not significantly affected by the CVP and on a project site outside a CVP use area, would receive a **minimal** rating.

CRITERION #13 - PROJECT URGENCY

FOR ACQUISITION, RESTORATION, AND RESEARCH PROPOSALS

The purpose of this criterion is to evaluate and assign a scale of urgency to an action, based on: 1) the level of endangerment of a species addressed in a proposal and 2) the resulting threat to species should the action not be carried out. During proposal evaluation, the Technical Team will ask the

question “How badly do we need to do this project?” in the context of the overall goals of the CVPCP and HRP.

Examples of a proposal receiving a **major** ranking might be a land acquisition in which the parcel in question supports federally listed, CVP-impacted species but is under the immediate threat of development; or a proposal in which an action (in either of the three categories) addresses the needs of a species threatened with extinction (critically endangered) unless effective recovery actions (contained in the proposal) are not carried out.

CRITERION #14 - TECHNICAL MERIT AND COMPLETENESS OF PROPOSAL

FOR ACQUISITION, RESTORATION, AND RESEARCH PROPOSALS

Proposals should be well-described and will be ranked for completeness and technical accuracy. The Technical Team will consider how well the objectives and methods are explained; whether backup documentation is complete and detailed; quality of maps and tables; how well the proposal addresses the ranking criteria; and how well the proposal package adhered to the required format. In addition to being reviewed and ranked by the CVPCP & HRP Technical Team, Research proposals will also be forwarded to scientific experts in the various fields of research topics, species, and/or habitats so that they can be reviewed for technical accuracy. For Research proposals, clear and complete methodology must be described.

CRITERION #15 – SCIENTIFIC MERIT

FOR RESEARCH PROPOSALS

This criterion considers the scientific rigor of the proposed project. The proposal will be evaluated on its scientific soundness, appropriateness of methods, cohesiveness of argument, organization and clarity of methods (statistical design and analysis), and length relative to information content. This evaluation will take into account supplemental technical “peer” reviews provided to the ranking team.

A **high** rank will be awarded to concise proposals with exceptional scientific soundness and clearly described and appropriate methods. A **moderate** rank will be assigned to proposals with minor methodological flaws or lack of clarity, but the proposal will be scientifically sound. A **low** rank will be assigned to proposals with significant methodological flaws, flawed reasoning, and/or extensive lack of clarity.

CRITERION #16 - ACRES

FOR ACQUISITION AND RESTORATION PROPOSALS

No ranking is applied. This criterion specifies amount of acres applicable to a proposed acquisition or restoration project.

CRITERION #17 - CVPCP/HRP COST

FOR ACQUISITION, RESTORATION, AND RESEARCH PROPOSALS

No ranking is applied to this criterion, but the information is used to evaluate the relative amount of cost-share contributions to be provided by partners.

CRITERION #18 - TOTAL COST

FOR ACQUISITION, RESTORATION, AND RESEARCH PROPOSALS

No ranking is applied to this criterion, but the information is used to evaluate the relative amount of cost-share contributions to be provided by partners.

CRITERION #19 - TOTAL POINTS

FOR ACQUISITION, RESTORATION, AND RESEARCH PROPOSALS

This sums all points received for the evaluation and ranking criteria for a particular proposal in a particular activity category. Because not all of the evaluation and ranking criteria apply to each of the activity categories, each activity category may have a unique total potential number of points, and as a consequence proposals are evaluated and ranked within activity categories. Total points are evaluated in the context of General Considerations, as specified in Section V.A.2., Subsection II.

SECTION VI -- AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

VI.A. AWARD NOTICES

Successful applicants will receive a notice of award of a Grant, Cooperative, or Interagency Agreement document by mail, signed by a Grants Officer, notifying the applicant of the project award amount by May 2010. Unsuccessful applicants will also be notified by mail. Notification is sent to the official who signs the SF 424.

VI.B. AWARD DOCUMENT

If your organization is awarded an agreement, the applicable portions of Sections II, III, IV and VII of your proposal submitted under this Funding Opportunity Application will be included in the resulting agreement.

VI.C. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS AND DISTRIBUTION

If your organization is awarded an agreement as a result of this Funding Opportunity Application, agencies (Reclamation/Service) may require you to submit the following types of reports during the performance period of the agreement. Detailed information on the type, frequency, and distribution of these reports is available at <http://intra.usbr.gov/mso/aamd/acquisition-toolkit.html>, under Financial Assistance, Standard Terms & Conditions – Grants & Cooperative Agreements.

VI.C.1. Financial Reports

- SF-425, Financial Status Report

VI.C.2. Program Performance Reports

- Quarterly or Semi-Annual Performance Progress Reports
- Annual Reports
- Draft (Final) Report
- Final Report

VI.C.3. Geospatial Information System Data Report*

***For all funded projects concerning protection and/or restoration of lands in your project area, we request that you send us information in geospatial/GIS format. We prefer that the data be sent as an ESRI shape file (*.shp) projected in Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM), North American Datum (NAD) 83, the Fish and Wildlife Service Standard. Metadata (data documentation) is mandated for all Federal geospatial data. Therefore, for each shape file, please complete and submit the metadata form included in the FOA (see *Attachment C*).**

ATTACHMENT C**VI.C.3. Geospatial Information System Data Report – This form must be submitted for all metadata****Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office
Metadata Form**

USFWS File (TAILS) Number 81420-

Reference Number from Letter

Project Title:

Descriptive title with project name (Ninth Hole Project boundary).

Information Originator:

Who is creating the data (Contractor's name, company name, address, phone number, email address).

Purpose:

For whom or what project is the data being created (i.e. applicant).

Information Creation Date:

Date or dates.

Data Status:

Complete/To be updated.

Process Step:

How was the data created or collected? What is the estimated positional accuracy and what is accuracy based on? (GPS, Aerial photo resolution, etc.)

File Format:

Shape file, TFW, etc.

Projection and Datum:

UTM Zone 10 or 11, NAD83

Attribute Information:

Information (If applicable): Data dictionary for any attribute definitions.

Data Provided In:

Email, CD, DVD

Metadata guidelines may be accessed at www.fgdc.gov

VI.C.4. Significant Developments Reports

During the term of the agreement, the Recipient must immediately notify the Programs if any of the following conditions occur:

- a) Problems, delays, or adverse conditions which will impair the Recipient's ability to meet the terms and conditions of the agreement;
- b) Favorable developments which will enable the Recipient to complete the scope of work under budget and/or under an accelerated schedule.

This notification is to include information on the actions taken or contemplated to resolve problems, delays, or adverse conditions, and any assistance needed from Reclamation/Service to help resolve the problem.

VI.C.5. Data Reports

Any raw data, and the analytical tools to help process the raw data, will be included in the Final Reports (for Research Projects).

VI.C.6. Published Reports

Where data warrant, results from Research Projects should be published and a copy submitted to the CVPCP and HRP.

SECTION VII -- OTHER INFORMATION

Please note that all contracts for projects that are funded by the CVPCP and/or HRP cannot extend past 5 years.

If you are awarded a Grant or Cooperative Agreement as a result of this Funding Opportunity Application, General and Special Provisions will be included in the agreement at time of award. The provisions are available at <http://intra.usbr.gov/mso/aamd/acquisition-toolkit.html> under Financial Assistance, Standard Terms & Conditions – Grants & Cooperative Agreements.